

## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The Official Action objects to Fig. 30 of drawings because the reference numeral "623" was not mentioned in the description. The specification is now amended to include reference to "623" at paragraph [0161]. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

The Abstract of the Disclosure is objected to for being more than one paragraph. The Abstract is hereby amended to be only a single paragraph.

The Specification is objected to at page 57, line 15 for a typographical error regarding reference numerals. This portion of the specification is now amended to provide the proper reference numerals.

Claims 8-14 and 27-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. As suggested by the Examiner, Claims 8 and 27 are amended to recite that the program is stored on a computer readable medium. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's suggestion. Original Claims 15 and 36 are canceled by this Amendment, as they were drawn to a recording medium on which the program is recorded.

Independent Claims 1, 8 and 16 pertain to an image forming device. The image forming device includes a receiving unit for successively receiving constituent data of a document file and a storing unit for successively storing objects contained in the constituent data. The image forming device further includes a judging unit that judges whether all of the necessary objects out of a plurality of objects contained in the document file are stored in the storing unit and an image forming unit that forms

images of a specific page when it is judged by the judging unit that all objects necessary for displaying the specific page are stored in the storing unit regardless of whether the plurality of objects included in the document file have been stored in the storing unit or not. The claimed subject matter further provides for an image forming program and an image forming method with the features described above.

Additionally, independent Claims 18, 27 and 37 provide for an image forming device, program, and method, including a receiving unit and storing unit as described above, and further including a judging unit for judging whether the amount of usage of the storing unit has exceeded a prescribed limit of usage. The image forming device, program, and method also include an image forming unit for forming images of objects stored in the storing unit either singly or in combination of two or more regardless of the order displayed in the document when it is judged by the judging unit that the amount of usage of the storing unit has exceeded the prescribed limit of usage. Further, a deleting unit deletes the object whose image has been formed by the image forming unit from the storing unit.

Claims 1, 7, 8, 14-18, 25-27, 34, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lester (U.S. Patent Application Publication 200/0140958).

In rejecting independent Claims 1, 8 and 16, the Official Action relies on the disclosure of Lester at paragraphs [0041]-[0044]. This passage describes the receipt of a PDF file at a printer. Commands of the PDF file are parsed in a sequential manner by an interpreter. The commands accumulate on a data structure. The interpreter determines if the end of the file is encountered. If the end is not encountered, then the interpreter continues parse the commands of the PDF file. If

the end of the file is encountered, device ready bits are produced and the document is printed. As best understood, the Official Action equates the commands of the PDF file in Lester with the claimed objects of the document, the interpreter with the claimed judging unit, and the data stack with the claimed storing unit.

Amended Claim 1 provides for the document file to contain a plurality of pages and a plurality of objects for displaying a part or all of the contents of each page of the document, a receiving unit, a storing unit, and a judging unit for judging whether all of the objects necessary for displaying a specific page out of the plurality of objects in the document file are stored in the storing unit. Amended Claim 1 further provides for an image forming unit for forming images of the specific page when the judging unit judges that all objects necessary for displaying the specific page are stored in the storing unit regardless of whether the plurality of objects included in the document file have been stored in the storing unit or not.

Lester does not disclose an image forming unit that forms images of a specific page when the judging unit judges that all objects necessary for displaying the specific page are stored in the storing unit regardless of whether the plurality of objects included in the document file have been stored in the storing unit or not. In contrast, Lester discloses that the commands of the PDF file are parsed and accumulated on a data structure, and only when the end of the file is encountered, are the device ready bits produced to print the document. In other words, Lester's disclosure provides that the device ready bits, which the Official Action appears to equate to the claimed image of a specific page, are produced only when the end of a file is encountered and all of the commands are stored on a data structure. Thus, the device ready bits are not produced regardless of whether a plurality of

commands has been stored in the data structure or not. In Lester, the device ready bits are not produced if the entire file is not received and stored in the data structure. Because Lester does not disclose each element of Claim 1, the anticipatory rejection based on Lester is improper. Accordingly, allowance and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 8 and 16, as amended, recite features similar to those discussed above in Claim 1. Specifically, both Claims 8 and 16 provide for an image forming unit for forming images of the specific page when the judging unit judges that all objects necessary for displaying the specific page are stored in the storing unit regardless of whether the plurality of objects included in the document file have been stored in the storing unit or not. As noted above, this feature is not present in Lester. Accordingly, allowance and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In rejecting independent Claims 18, 27 and 36, the Official Action again relies on the disclosure of Lester at paragraphs [0041]-[0044]. As noted above, Lester describes the receipt of a PDF file at a printer, and the parsing of commands from the PDF file by an interpreter. The commands are accumulated at a data structure. The interpreter determines if the end of the file has been reached. If the end has not been reached, the interpreter continues to parse commands. If the end has been reached, device ready bits are produced and the document is printed.

Amended Claim 18, recites, *inter alia*, a judging unit for judging whether the amount of usage of the storing unit has exceeded a prescribed limit of usage, and an image forming unit for forming images of objects stored in a storing unit regardless of the order displayed in the document when it is judged by the judging unit that the amount of usage of the storing unit has exceeded the prescribed limit of usage.

Further, Claim 18 provides for a deleting unit for deleting the object whose image has been formed by the image forming unit from the storing unit.

Lester does not disclose the judging unit, image forming unit, or deleting unit as claimed. As best understood, the Official Action equates the interpreter of Lester with the claimed judging unit. The interpreter only parses commands from the file and determines if the end of the file is reached. Thus, the interpreter does not judge whether the amount of usage of a storing unit has exceeded a prescribed limit of usage.

The Official Action appears to equate the production of device ready bits with the claimed image forming unit, in paragraph [0044]. There is no disclosure in Lester that an image is formed of the commands, or objects, regardless of the order they are displayed in the document. Additionally, Lester does not disclose that an image is formed of the objects when it is judged by the judging unit that the amount of usage of the storage unit has exceeded the prescribed limit of usage. Rather, the device ready bits are produced only when the end of the file is encountered. In other words, the production of the device ready bits is not in response to a prescribed limit of usage of the storage unit being exceeded.

Moreover, Lester does not provide a deleting unit for deleting the object whose image has been formed by the image forming unit from the storing unit. In Lester, there is no disclosure of the commands being deleted from the data stack. Because Lester fails to disclose the judging unit, image forming unit, and deleting unit as claimed, the anticipatory rejection based on Lester is improper. Accordingly, allowance and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 27 and 37 are amended to recite features similar to those of Claim 18. The discussion above is incorporated by reference here to apply to Claims 27 and 37. For the reasons above, allowance and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 27 and 37 are respectfully requested.

The remaining dependent claims ultimately depend from one of the independent claims discussed above, which are allowable. For at least this reason, the remaining dependent claims are also allowable.


Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: May 9, 2008

By:

  
William C. Rowland  
Registration No. 30888

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620